

differences necessarily established in the Unity by individual existences with the faculty of intellectual knowledge. Not that those who believe in the ultimate Unity of mysticism necessarily suppose that individual existence is a *defect*, though a nuance of this opinion is perceptible both in Platonism and Buddhism. It is just as consonant with the convictions of mysticism to believe that individual existence is a necessary means towards the self-explication and self-consciousness of the One. In order that the One shall be conscious of itself it needs the individual mind, and it needs the development of the mind to the point at which it recognises that its own inevitable intellectual perspectives are only perspectives. When a finite existence recognizes the conditions of its own existence, and a finite mind recognizes the conditions of its own operation, and these conditions are felt not as burdensome and oppressive, but merely as necessary, the pathway of the One into that individual existence is cleared of obstacles. The intellect has ceased to usurp a sovereignty to which it has no rightful claim.

Since Mysticism is irreconcilable with any Dualism, we have a short way of dealing with the assertions now frequently made by modern men of science that the modern scientific view of the world "leaves room for" Mysticism. Before being grateful for this condescension, we must inquire what kind of mysticism it is for which the modern scientist leaves room. If it is a dualistic mysticism, it is simply not mysticism; but an attempt to reimpose under that name the dualistic religion from which the Western mind is painfully struggling to free itself.

I cannot, in this brief space, permit myself the luxury of long quotations from such modern scientific apologists of 'mysticism' as Professors Eddington and Haldane. But it is true to say of both of them that the mysticism for which they wish to find room is a mysticism of 'values', or of 'morality'. "The real world," as Professor Haldane puts it, "is the spiritual world of values." Without discussing whether this statement is true, or whether it has any *meaning*, we can state quite peremptorily that this 'mysticism' is not mysticism at all. Mysticism knows nothing of "a spiritual world of values" as distinct from a "material world of facts." The One of true mysticism is not the Good, or the True, or the Beautiful; it is the One. And in the One the Bad, the False, and the Ugly exist no less than the Good, the True, and the Beautiful. All alike, for true mysticism, are in some sense appearance. The goodness of the good thing is its element of appearance; because we call it good only in so far as, in some obvious or obscure manner, it promotes the fundamental propulsive energy of some individual human existences. And the badness of the bad thing is likewise its element of appearance. Their sheer existence alone is real.

True mysticism is beyond good and evil; and the mysticism which seeks to persuade itself or others that the One is good is a false mysticism. Mysticism does not seek to impose its personal terms upon the One. The One is not what we like, but that to which we